Research Paper Outline

Title Page

- **Title**: The Financial Impact of Revenue Sharing on Collegiate Basketball Programs during March Madness
- **Other Information**: Duvine Beebe, Erskine Student, Class: Economics and Finance of Sport, Instructor: Joseph Elledge, Date: 11/4/24

Abstract

A brief, one-paragraph summary of the research paper's focus:

- **Content**: The abstract introduces the topic of revenue sharing in NCAA basketball during March Madness. It briefly covers the paper's thesis on revenue sharing as both a financial stabilizer for smaller programs and a model that can inadvertently favor larger, high-performing schools. The abstract will set up key discussion points on the revenue-sharing model's advantages and potential inequalities within collegiate basketball.

Introduction

1. **Hook**: An engaging fact or statistic about the revenue generated by March Madness (e.g., billions in TV rights and sponsorships).
2. **Background**: Explanation of how revenue sharing operates in college basketball, particularly its relevance to March Madness and the financial structure of NCAA.
3. **Thesis Statement**:
    - Main Argument: Revenue sharing in March Madness provides essential funding for smaller programs but also creates financial disparities favoring powerhouse programs.
4. **Purpose of Study**: To explore the financial effects of this revenue distribution model and how it influences competitive balance and financial stability for participating programs.

Body Sections

Section 1: The Revenue Sharing Model in March Madness

- **Main Point**: Breakdown of how revenue from March Madness is distributed among NCAA programs.

- **Supporting Evidence**: Refer to the March Madness revenue model outlined in "The Financial Impact of Revenue Sharing" document and findings from **Goldfisher's** economic impact analysis in the annotated bibliography.
- **Analysis**: Discuss the financial implications for schools with different competitive levels, including how smaller schools depend on this income for athletic department funding.

Section 2: Financial Benefits for Smaller Programs

- **Main Point**: Revenue sharing acts as a financial lifeline for underfunded collegiate programs.
- **Supporting Evidence**: Draw from **Edelman's** analysis on athlete rights and financial policy impacts and **Thompson's** findings on how Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) policies interact with traditional revenue-sharing models.
- **Analysis**: Explain how this funding is used by smaller programs to cover costs and maintain operational stability. Examine if revenue sharing successfully promotes competitive balance.

Section 3: Inequities in Revenue Distribution

- **Main Point**: The current revenue-sharing system often advantages high-performing, larger programs, creating financial imbalances.
- **Supporting Evidence**: Use **Sullivan et al.** and **Melouk & Keskin's** operational studies on how policies and tournament structures contribute to uneven financial distributions.
- **Analysis**: Evaluate if the current model's structure contributes to financial disparities similar to those seen in professional sports. Discuss whether changes inspired by professional revenue-sharing models could benefit NCAA's model.

Conclusion

1. **Restatement of Thesis**: Revenue sharing during March Madness is essential for financial stability in smaller programs but inadvertently supports larger programs.
2. **Summary of Key Points**: Recap the main arguments on revenue distribution, financial support for smaller programs, and inequities created by the current model.

3. **Closing Statement**: A reflection on the need for possible NCAA policy adjustments to address financial disparities, ensuring a fair competitive landscape.

References

A list of sources, formatted in APA style:

1. Edelman, M. (2014). *The District Court Decision in O'Bannon v. National Collegiate Athletic Association*. Washington and Lee Law Review, 71(4), 2318A.
2. Goldfisher, A. (1997). *Western Regional Finals Brought Big Spenders to San Jose*. Silicon Valley/San Jose Business Journal, 10.
3. Melouk, S. H., & Keskin, B. B. (2012). *Team Assignments and Scheduling for the NCAA Basketball Tournament*. The Journal of the Operational Research Society, 63(5), 620–630.
4. Sullivan, W. M., et al. (2024). *Is the 'Revered Tradition of Amateurism' Over for College Sports?* Intellectual Property & Technology Law Journal, 36(9), 8–13.
5. Thompson, T. P. (2022). *Maximizing NIL Rights for College Athletes*. Iowa Law Review, 107(3), 1347–1387.